REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and following remarks, reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

By the current Amendment claims 1-20 have been canceled, and claims 21-40 have been added.

In response to the Examiner's requirement for a new title, the title has been changed to --Glass Touch Panel with Adhesive Having Hygroscopic Fine Particles--.

In response to the informalities noted by the Examiner in section 6 on pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the specification has been revised so as to address these informalities. Also, the specification in its entirety has been reviewed and revised so as to generally improve its form. All revisions to the specification have been presented in the form of a substitute specification. No new matter has been added by the substitute specification.

In response to the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, rejection of claim 19, claim 19 has been rewritten as new claim 39 which is believed to be free of the 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, concerns expressed by the Examiner, and is otherwise believed to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. In this regard, please note that claim 19 was intended to convey that the claimed voltage exists in the range between the lower and upper limit voltages. Also, claim 19 was intended to convey that a voltage is transmitted as indication of contact with the touch panel.

The instant invention pertains to a glass touch panel which is excellent in terms of high temperature and high humidity resistance. Glass touch panels are generally known in the art, but suffer from drawbacks, as expressed on pages 1-2 of the original specification.

Applicants have addressed and resolved these drawbacks by developing a unique glass touch panel. With reference to Figure 2, for example, the glass touch panel comprises a first transparent glass substrate 1a having thereon a first transparent conductive film 2a, and a second transparent glass substrate 1b having thereon a second transparent conductive film 2b. Transparent conductive film 2a and transparent conductive film 2b oppose one another. The first transparent glass substrate 1a and the second transparent glass substrate 1b are bonded to one another via an adhesive 6 in which fine particles having hygroscopic features are mixed. It is the

provision of these fine particles that enable the glass touch panel to exhibit high temperature and high humidity resistance. Claim 21 is believed to be representative of this inventive glass touch panel.

The Examiner rejected claims 1, 7-11, 13, 14, 16 and 18-20 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. and further in view of Iwanaga et al. Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. and further in view of Rainer. Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al and further in view of Kent et al. Claim 5 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view Nishijima et al. and Kent et al. and further in view of Swift et al. Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al., Kent et al., Swift et al. and further of "Paste for electronic materials". Claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. and further in view of Maeda et al. And, claim 17 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sato in view of Nishijima et al. and further in view of Tannas, Jr. These rejections are respectfully traversed and the references relied upon by the Examiner are not applicable with regard to the newly added claims for the following reasons.

In rejecting the claims, the Examiner recognized that Sato, while disclosing a touch panel, does not disclose an adhesive mixed with hygroscopic particles for bonding together substrates of the touch panel. Accordingly, the Examiner relied upon Nishijima et al. for a teaching of an adhesive mixed with hygroscopic particles. However, it is respectfully submitted that Nishijima et al. does not disclose or suggest an "adhesive", let alone an adhesive mixed with hygroscopic particles used to bond substrates to one another, such that a combination of Sato and Nishijima et al. would not result in the invention as recited in independent claim 1 or independent claim 21.

In this regard, while Nishijima et al. does disclose a hygroscopic substance 6, this substance is **not** an adhesive. Specifically, Nishijima et al. describes this substance as "a moisture sensing resistive substance 6 adhered...to the fiber 5" (column 4, lines 49-51), and also states, "the moisture sensing resistive substance 6 adhered to the monofilament 5" (column 5,

lines 12-13). Thus, because substance 6 is merely something which is adhered to a member, and is not disclosed to bond or adhere two members together, it is respectfully submitted that this substance is not an adhesive as is generally known in the art.

In describing the substance 6, Nishijima et al. states "The moisture sensing resistive substance...typically...is a hygroscopic high polymer in which a plurality of conductive particles are dispersed" (column 6, lines 43 - 47). However, this says absolutely nothing about an **adhesive** mixed with hygroscopic fine particles. The hygroscopic high polymer having conductive particles therein, as disclosed by Nishijima et al., is clearly very different from the adhesive with hygroscopic fine particles therein, as required by claim 21.

Additionally, even if substance 6 could somehow be broadly construed to be an adhesive, because there is no teaching or suggestion in Nishijima et al. of using this substance to bond two substrates together, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to use substance 6 to bond the two substrates of the touch panel of Sato to one another.

Furthermore, assuming arguendo that substance 6 of Nishijima et al. can be construed to be an adhesive that could be used to bond two substrates to one another, because of the differences between a sensor as disclosed by Nishijima et al. and a touch panel as disclosed by Sato, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have found it obvious to combine the teachings of these references. In this regard, in explaining the motivation for modifying Sato in view of Nishijima et al., the Examiner states

> Here he [Nishijima et al.] further discloses that the moisture resistive substance is 'capable of changing an electrical resistance... by absorbing a moisture'...One would have been motivated to make such a change based on the teaching of Nishijima...to have a moisture resistive substance that is 'capable of changing an electrical resistance ...by absorbing a moisture'.

However, a touch panel as disclosed by Sato is not concerned with having a capability for changing an electrical resistance by absorbing moisture. While a capability of changing electrical resistance may be advantageous or necessary in the sensor of Nishijima et al, there is no reason to believe that such a capability is wanted or necessary in the touch panel of Sato. Indeed, because

concepts associated with a sensor, as disclosed by Nishijima et al., are completely different than those associated with a touch panel as disclosed by Sato, it is respectfully submitted that one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated to modify Sato in view of Nishijima et al. as suggested by the Examiner, even if substance 6 of Nishijima et al. was an adhesive, having hygroscopic particles mixed therein, that could be used to bond two substrates together.

None of the other references relied upon resolve the deficiencies of Sato and Nishijima et al., and accordingly claims 21 - 40 are allowable over any possible combination of these references.

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and an early Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

If after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner believes that any issues remain which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' undersigned representative by telephone to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Kiyohiro YOKOYAMA et al.

THE COMMISSIONER IS AUTHORIZED TO CHARGE ANY DEFICIENCY IN THE FEES FOR THIS PAPER TO DEPOSIT ACCOUNT NO. 23-0975

By: Joseph M. Gorski

Joseph M. Gorski
Registration No. 46,500
Attorney for Applicants

JMG/tg
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
February 27, 2004